

Appl. No. 10/655,146
Amtd. Dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2005

REMARKS

Applicants thank Examiner for acknowledging receipt of foreign priority document, Japanese Application No. JP2002-267847, that has been submitted pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 119 and/or PCT Rule 17.2(a).

Claims 5 - 9 have been added in order to claim further subject matter as disclosed in the specification.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Examiner's rejection of claims 1 - 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Examiner has rejected these claims in view of the cited prior art reference of Nishio et al. (Japanese Patent Pub. No. 2001-100668). The Nishio reference is directed to providing an electroluminescent display device of increased size by securing plural small-size panels, each incorporating plural electroluminescent elements, to a large-size support with an intervening adhesive layer. (See the Abstract of the invention). However, nothing in Nishio teaches or suggests Applicant's currently claimed invention.

More specifically, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 in order to more specifically point out the features of the invention. Nishio fails to teach or suggest a seal material applied on the side of a drive panel opposite the side provided with organic electroluminescent devices and the seal panel, and wherein light is emitted to the outside from the side of the seal panel. Applicant's invention provides for a seal material applied in the gap between adjacent drive panels and extending in a width direction over surfaces of each adjacent drive panel so as to completely cover the portions of the exposed OLED

Appl. No. 10/655,146
Amtd. Dated September 15, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 15, 2005

devices 41 on the edges of the drive panel (See Figure 2). Furthermore, Applicant's invention provides for a plate-like material provided at least over said seal material to enhance the heat dissipation properties of the device. Nishio fails to teach or suggest anything regarding this advance in the art.

In regard to Examiner's rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), Applicants submit that, at least for the reasons cited above, Nishio fails to teach or suggest Applicant's currently claimed invention.

Examiner's remaining references cited but not relied upon, considered either alone or in combination, also fail to teach Applicant's currently claimed invention. In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims now stand in condition for allowance.

Date:

9/15/05



(Reg. #37,607)

Robert J. Depke
**TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GIANGIORGI
BLACKSTONE & MARR, LTD.**
105 W. Adams Street, 36th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60603
Tel: (312) 704-1890
Attorney for Applicants